

No. 2.

HAMILTON, 6TH APRIL, 1860.

*To the Congregation of the
Macnab Street Presbyterian Church, Hamilton :*

The hereinafter specified facts in the lives of some of the Rulers, and would-be chief men of the said congregation, will be found a sound antidote to any supposed advantage—trifling and temporary—to them, by their gross baseness, at the special meeting of said congregation, held in the Basement of said Church, on Monday evening, the 20th day of February last, hereafter described ; and also give a very forcible illustration of the following passage of Scripture :—

JEREMIAH, cap. VI., v. 13, 14.—“ And from the prophet even unto the priest, *(these were the officers and ministers of the Jewish Church)* every one dealeth falsely. Were they ashamed when they committed abomination ? Nay, they were not at all ashamed, neither could they blush : therefore shall they fall.”

I, after having exhausted every method which could be devised, to induce the Reverend David Inglis and the Rulers of our congregation, to respect their oaths of office, and perform the same, and failed therein ; and having also failed in inducing the Trustees to call a meeting of the congregation, to consider these matters, brought an action of ejectment against the Trustees and Deacons, to try the question by a Law court, whether the Trust deed of our Church can be so grossly violated, as it has been by David Inglis and our Session. I felt it to be folly to appeal to our Church courts, composed, it is well known, of Ministers, the majority of whom do not believe the Standards of their Church ; although they have all sworn that they did ; and that they would firmly and constantly adhere to the same. The Trustees should have called you together forthwith, as it was your right to determine what should be done in respect of the action ; but David Inglis—who has on more than one occasion, pertinaciously claimed the arrogant and unjust position of presiding at all your congregational meetings, dared not preside on such an occasion, for fear of his Millenarian heresy—must be got out of the way, hence he goes to Montreal, on pretence of preaching the Gospel there ;

thereafter, you the congregation had to be "whipped in," and Robert Hopkins—one of your Elders and a Trustee—undertook to do that, by visitations, prayer meetings, &c., in the true "Ryersonian" style of business. Yea, even Donald McLellan, another one of your Elders, in the prayer meetings held by him during that period, prayed for me, specially naming me in his prayers, which as being unknown to me at the time, and as not desired by me, could not do me hurt, as otherwise same might; for it is written, Proverbs, cap. xv., v. 8: "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord," and what is "an abomination to the Lord" must work evil.

The "whipping in" however was found a much greater labor than expected, hence, as it required two days notice of a special meeting, David had to stay over at Montreal another week; the meeting was held on the evening above named, and David returned the forenoon of the following day. At which meeting, said Robert Hopkins presided, and another one of your Elders, Alexander McKenzie, acted as Secretary.

The said meeting was a very large meeting, in fact about the largest meeting of the congregation yet held.

Hopkins, as chairman, rose and said, that he knew little about the matters for which the meeting was called—a most deliberate and base falsehood—and therefore he would call on the Secretary to explain what he knew, and sat down; whereupon the Secretary—who also had a full knowledge of all the matters—rose, and in a manner so very confused as not to be understood, stated not one-half of the causes of the meeting. He could not plead ignorance of the nature of the Millenarian heresy—one of the chief causes—as he holds it. William Davidson, (a recent member of Knox's Church, and one of the great supporters of the Rev. Robert Irvine, until the recent "disruption" in that congregation,) immediately rose and said, that he had a resolution which he would move, and which he read,—the very reflex of his own spirit, "for a tree is known by its fruit"—containing gross falsehoods, and charges of malice against myself, and which was concocted by him, Hopkins, &c., at Hopkins' shop, and after spueing out some more of his filth, in the shape of falsehood, as to persecution, &c., he sat down; one Monroe, who only became a member of the congregation at last Sacrament of the Supper, seconded it; whereupon Doctor Macdonald, feeling keenly that the malice might apply as much to him as to me,—as you will clearly see in the facts in his life hereinafter stated—rose and said, that he did not like the charge of malice, he thought it did not look well in a christian congregation, that it should be expunged; whereon, the congregation present almost unanimously signified their approval, by a *ruff* on the floor. Davidson rose and refused to amend his resolution, saying it was truth. Doctor Macdonald again rose and said that he thought it was not right; and again the great majority of the congregation expressed their disapproval of Davidson's base

falsehood,—thereby shewing clearly their belief in my integrity, and their detestation of Davidson—at which step, Hopkins foreseeing that *his* base resolution—for it was really his, Davidson was merely his tool and creature—would not pass, rose and asked the parties concerned to step up to the table at which he sat, and re-arrange the resolution, with a wink to his creature Davidson, who forthwith with Donald McLellan aforesaid—known familiarly as “Holy Donald”—Doctor Macdonald, Hopkins and McKenzie, with considerable planning concocted the following resolution:—

“That this meeting viewing the action of ejection instituted by a member of the congregation against the Trustees and Deacons of this Church, as being utterly groundless; and expressing as we do unabated confidence in our esteemed pastor, approve of the action already taken in the matter by our Trustees; and further authorise and instruct said Trustees to continue the defence, associating with Mr. Macdonald, the best legal talent they can command, and as they and he may agree upon.”

(*Note.*—I cannot resist expressing my cordial assent to the latter portion, namely, the procuring of the “best legal talent,” for it is assuredly much required.)

Which resolution, Hopkins read and immediately put to the meeting. Whereupon Mr. John Baine—a person of some spirit, and evidently not one of the “whipped in”—rose and asked for some explanation why the meeting was called, as he said he had heard none as yet. Hopkins again declared that he knew not. Mr. Baine then asked, if the summons did not shew the grounds of the action brought by Mr. Reid: to which Hopkins replied, “probably Mr. Walter Macdonald our lawyer might be able to tell.” Mr. Macdonald rose and said, that “the summons did not,” and sat down. I feeling that such unmixed baseness was no longer endurable, rose and said to Mr. Walter Macdonald, “you know sir the *whole* grounds of the action, I have very carefully and fully explained the same to you at several times, you have had the Trust deed from me and all the papers, and I have treated you most courteously, you had better take care of yourself.” Whereupon he rose with a face bearing evident signs of shame, for his conduct in not honestly at once giving the required information, and said, that I had treated him most courteously, and had fully explained to him the grounds of the action, and endeavoured—I have no doubt to the best of his ability—to explain the grounds; he did slightly explain two of the same, but imperfectly, another ground however he candidly stated he could not well comprehend, but it was because the question of the union of the two Churches or Synods, had not been brought before you. Hopkins then feeling that he would lose ground if the questions were discussed, rose and said, and repeated. “*We as a Congregation have nothing to do with our Minister, whether he preaches heresy or not, he is responsible to another Body, and to his God: we I say have nothing to do with it.*” He also said, “we have just called you together to

sustain the Trustees in defending the action"; and forthwith he again put the said resolution to the meeting, and asked all those who were in favor of it, to hold up their right hand : when lo !! and behold !! *not 30 held up their hands in favor of it :* but he in a minute or two thereafter, called out "carried, unanimously," a most flagrant violation of the truth, and ended the meeting, saying, "we have nothing more for you to do."

I have given above a full and truthful account of what was done at said meeting; and I will now state the facts in the lives, above promised,—and what I have stated and will state I am prepared to prove—and conclude with a few reflections. I begin with

THE REV. DAVID INGLIS.

And first. His contempt of his oaths. As he has been a minister in many churches, or different religious bodies, I will quote a portion of his oaths, taken by him in the Church by which he was licensed, and in the Church he now belongs. Firstly, then, his oath, upon being licensed to preach by the United Secession Church of Scotland, and which was,—

"Do you acknowledge the Westminster Confession of Faith, with the *Larger and Shorter Catechisms*, as the confession of your faith, *expressive of the sense in which you understand the Scriptures*; and do you resolve, through Divine Grace, *firmly and constantly to adhere to the doctrine contained in said Confession and Catechisms*, and to *assert and defend it to the utmost of your power against all contrary errors.*"

Secondly, His oath upon his admission into the Presbyterian Church of Canada (the Church we belong to) as a Minister thereof.

"I do hereby declare that I do sincerely own and believe the whole doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, as approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in the year one thousand six hundred and forty-seven, to be the truths of God, and I do own the purity of worship presently authorised and practiced in this church, and also the Presbyterian Government and Discipline thereof: which Doctrine, Worship and Church Government I am persuaded are founded on the Word of God, and are agreeable thereto; and I promise that, through the grace of God, I shall firmly and constantly adhere to the same, and to the utmost of my power shall in my station assert, maintain, and defend the said Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government of this Church, by Sessions, Presbyteries, and Synods; that I shall, in my practice, conform myself to the said Worship, and submit to the said Discipline and Government, and never endeavour, directly or indirectly, the prejudice or subversion of the same; and I promise that I shall follow no divisive course from the present order in the Church; renouncing all Doctrines, Tenets, and opinions whatsoever contrary to or inconsistent with the said Doctrine, Worship Discipline or Government of this Church."

Thirdly. His oath upon his ordination at Montreal; and again upon his ordination as your minister, namely:

"Do you sincerely own and believe the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith, approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in the year 1647, *to be founded upon the word of God*, and do you acknowledge the same as the confession of your faith; and will you *firmly*

"and constantly adhere thereto, and to the utmost of your power assert, maintain, and defend the same, and the purity of worship, as presently practised in our Church?"

"Do you disown all Popish, Arian, Socinian, Arminian, Erastian, and other doctrines, tenets, and opinions whatsoever, contrary to, or inconsistent with the foresaid Confession of Faith?"

These are some of his oaths, I will now quote from these standards,—which he swore to "be the truths of God," and which *he would firmly and constantly adhere to*," "maintain and defend"—a few passages.

Confession of Faith. Cap. viii, Sec. 4. "He (our Saviour) "ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of His Father, making intercession; and shall return to judge men and angels at the end of the world."

Shorter Catechism, answer to Question 29.—"Christ's exaltation consisteth in his rising again from the dead on the third day, in ascending up into Heaven, in sitting at the right hand of God the Father, and in coming to judge the world on the last day."

Larger Catechism, answer to Question 51.—"The estate of Christ's exaltation comprehendeth his resurrection, ascension, sitting at the right hand of the Father, and His coming again to judge the world."

Larger Catechism, answer to Question 53.—"Christ was exalted in his ascension in that *He visibly went up into the highest heavens*, there to receive gifts for men, to raise up our affections thither, and to prepare a place for us, *where He himself is, and shall continue till his second coming at the end of the world.*"

Larger Catechism, answer to Question 55.—"Christ maketh intercession by his appearing in our nature continually before the Father in Heaven."

Our next enquiry is,—What is the Millenarian heresy? and what has David Inglis preached in your pulpit since his said ordination oath? He has preached *that our Saviour is to come again at least 1000 years before the end of the world*; and that our Saviour is to reign personally at Jerusalem in the land of Judea during these 1000 years, with all the other abominations of that most pernicious and atrocious heresy, and he held these doctrines at the time he took his said last oath. Here is a fearfully direct violation of his said oaths, repeated so often. Not only is there no mention of our Saviour's return to this Earth, and of His reigning personally at Jerusalem for 1000 years before the end of the world, in these standards, he swore he believed to be "the truths of God," but there is a clear and direct denial of the same, namely, "*His coming again to judge the world at the last day.*" "*He visibly went up into the highest heavens, where He himself is, and shall continue till His second coming at the end of the world.*" What language can be clearer? Millenarians say that the word *again*, there used, does not exclude the doctrine of our Saviour's coming to reign personally at Jerusalem, before He

comes to judge the world. But take the words used in respect of our Saviour's resurrection from the dead. "In his rising again from the dead"; and read the words used in describing his return; "And His coming again to judge the world;" these are precisely identical. "*His rising again*:" "*His coming again*:" Will David Inglis dare say, that our Saviour rose from the dead more than once, or could have risen more than once? he dare not. What daring audacity then to assert, in the face of the same language, that He will return more than 1000 years before the judgment day, to reign personally at Jerusalem. But we all know, that unfortunately for the cause of truth, the audaciousness of heretics is usually the cause of the success of their heresy. However, so as to exclude even a possibility of a doubt, that the word *again* should not be misconstrued, the word *second* is also used, and that *second coming* is declared to be to *judge the world*, not to reign personally at Jerusalem in perfect peace for 1000 years, as David Inglis falsely alleges; yea, most perniciously and atrociously,—for as there cannot be a soul saved without the agency of the Holy Spirit or the "comforter;" and as such intercession will be required until the judgment day, or the end of the world; and as the intercession of our Saviour can only be made "in Heaven, before the Father," "in our nature," as declared by said standards; and as the human nature of Christ can only be in one place at one and the same time; therefore, when our Saviour comes to reign at Jerusalem, as David alleges and preaches, His intercession must cease, as He will be no longer "in our nature before the Father in heaven," as the said standards declare, and further, as our Saviour when on earth declared, that until He ascended into Heaven, "The Comforter" could not come to earth, where His peculiar work is to be done, but that when He—our Saviour—went up, He would send the Comforter; therefore, the moment our Saviour again descends to earth, the "Comforter" ascends to Heaven; hence, the agency of the Holy Spirit being thus ended,—as it cannot be performed in Heaven, all human beings then living on this earth, not saved, with all who are born and die ere our Saviour again ascends into Heaven,—which will be at least the 1000 years, and the Holy Spirit descends to earth, must be eternally damned, their everlasting portion will be in Hell. And this would be unquestionably one of the awful results if these Millenarian doctrines preached by David Inglis, are "the truths of God." I ask you solemnly to reflect upon these matters, and I ask the question, can any doctrine be more atrociously blasphemous than that heresy? and I answer thereto, assuredly not.

SECONDLY.—David Inglis' great unpopularity with his congregation. The vote of confidence in him lost. The very unjust charge of malice against me, almost unanimously reprobated by the congregation. Notwithstanding Hopkins praying and drumming for nearly three

weeks, *thirty* of the congregation could not be got to vote for the aforesaid resolution,—a vote of confidence in David Inglis—read the same, “and expressing as we do unabated confidence in our esteemed pastor,” and those who did vote for it were almost wholly composed of office bearers, (of whom there were not a few) and recent members of the church, such as Davidson, Monroe, George Mackay, James Osborne, &c., who came to our church, not from any respect for David Inglis, as is well known, but because their filthy quarrels with the Rev. Robert Irvine—their former “esteemed pastor”—drove them out of his congregation, (renegades are always the most violent) and Mrs. Anderson and her servant girl, who are almost strangers in our church. *Except office bearers, scarcely an old member of the Congregation voted for it*: how very galling and mortifying to David Inglis, that out of his large congregation not *thirty* of them could be got to say publicly at the said meeting, that they had *confidence* in him: what a truly miserable position!!! And again, when I was attacked by Davidson as aforesaid, that the aforesaid meeting almost unanimously, and unasked by me, or any one on my behalf, reprobated the false and base charge of malice against me; thereby expressing strongly their confidence in my integrity. Facts like these are stubborn things, and shew clearly and undeniably, David Inglis’ great unpopularity in his congregation; and the congregation’s great respect for me; that they did—notwithstanding the great efforts of the aforesaid rulers—free me of every charge of improper conduct in the matters in question, so brought against me at said meeting, wherein I could not defend myself as they well knew. The constitution adopted by the congregation excluding me: thus rendering their attack upon me doleful and compelling me to adopt this method of defence, as the only one I can take.

Next in order is

ROBERT HOPKINS.

And first. His attempted purchase of David Inglis, by the presentation to David Inglis by him, of £100, immediately before David Inglis left Montreal for this city, as related by Hopkins to me, on more than one occasion.

He Hopkins said that he knew Mr. Inglis was somewhat in want of money, and he was determined out of his small means to assist him, and therefore he took with him when he went to Montreal, £100, and *presented* it to Mr. Inglis, as a mark of respect, to a worthy and devoted servant of the Lord: to which Mr. Inglis replied that if it was given to him solely from a true Christian spirit, and as an offering to the Lord, he would accept of it, but otherwise he could not. And he Hopkins then again assured him, that he gave it from the heart, as a portion of the means with which the Lord had blessed him, and to which the Lord was entitled, and that he felt as it came from the Lord, he could not do better with it, than to assist such a

godly and devoted Minister of Christ as he Mr. Inglis was; and again pressed its acceptance; whereupon Mr. Inglis, in the meekness of the Spirit of Divine grace, accepted of it, as sent from the Lord.

Much more of that kind of stuff was said, but the foregoing is a fair and sufficient specimen of "the presentation" as so related to me.

In the beginning of the first century of the Christian era, you are aware that Judas—a *Minister* of Christ, was bought with *thirty* pieces of silver, and which was a direct and effectual purchase of body and soul. The times, however, have since then changed, this is essentially the age of a right apprehension of the value of money, and a great refinement of manners,—straightforward and blunt actions being very nauseous in the Church as well as in the State—hence the presentation by Hopkins of 100 pieces of gold to David Inglis another *Minister* of Christ, (I do not say a *Christian* Minister, these two terms are alas too often confounded as having the same meaning, whereas the same are widely different) and the *gilding* of the same "with much fair speech."

SECONDLY. Hopkins' "unabated confidence in our esteemed pastor."

When Hopkins returned from the Synod at London, held since David Inglis' ordination here, and which he attended as your "ruling elder," I asked him, on the street, why he had returned so soon, as the Synod was not over, and he replied in true shoemaker style—yet highly expressive, "I was not going to be David Inglis' *slippers*,—and I so told him, as he expected I should go with him in some matters before the Synod, which I could not, I therefore left." You see some of the fruits of the "presentation."

At another time, and after David Inglis had repeatedly preached in our pulpit his Millenarian heresy, I reproached Hopkins with calling such a man to be our Minister, as he must have known David held these doctrines, to which he declared, that he did not know that David Inglis held such doctrines until he preached the same here, that he had been told so, and that he asked him at Montreal before his call, if he held these doctrines, and that Mr. Inglis assured him that he did not hold such doctrines, but that now he—Hopkins—was "sorry and disgusted with him."

At another time when David Inglis was lecturing on the Prophecies of Daniel, on the Thursday evening, Hopkins met me, and said "David gave Daniel a braw burial last night." I asked him what he meant. He replied, "You should have been present, he was finishing the book of Daniel, and his Millenarian doctrines were outrageous, I am disgusted."

And often and even during last winter, has Hopkins declared, that "David Inglis is no body." "We will soon be rid of him." "No body likes him." "He will not visit his congregation." "I have to do many of his duties," and many such remarks has he made.

Inglis was; and
in the meekness
from the Lord.
foregoing is a
related to me.

an era, you are
thirty pieces
se of body and
is essentially
y, and a great
actions being
te—hence the
Inglis another
ter, these two
ame meaning,
y of the same

emed pastor."

n, held since
your "ruing
d so soon, as
er style—yet
s' slippers,—
im in some
left." You

lly preached
Hopkins with
own David
t know that
e here, that
ore his call,
im that he
was "sorry

Prophecies
and said
him what
t, he was
ines were

ared, that
im," No
"I have to
le.

In the fall of 1858 Hopkins with Mr. Dingwall, one of your Deacons, called at my house, saying, that he was compelled to visit all the congregation as David Inglis had so sadly neglected his duty, in not doing so, and that he could not even get the elders to assist; and asked to be allowed to "pray with and for us," which liberty he got.

Now, what think you of Hopkins' "unabated confidence in our esteemed pastor"? Was he an *honest* man in such his vote? one who as an Elder of the church should be "without guile."

THIRDLY.—Hopkins' contempt of his oath of office.

He took the same oath on being ordained an Elder, as David Inglis did, on his ordination as a Minister in our church, and has he not treated such his oath with contempt, in supporting the said resolution, which supports David Inglis in the contempt of his oath. Yea verily, he has and that most broadly.

FOURTHLY.—Hopkins' audacious falsehood in pretending ignorance, and calling on Mr. Mackenzie and on Mr. Macdonald to inform the meeting what they knew about the matters in question.

I have not only had repeated conferences with Hopkins about David Inglis' heresy—and which he condemned as broadly as I did, but I sent him as an Elder, my printed address to the Elders, touching Inglis' heresy &c., and calling upon them to stop the same: and I also thereafter wrote him, as a Trustee, as well as the other Trustees, that the action would be brought unless the matters in question were set right. So that his ignorance was merely pretended, for the purpose of keeping you as much in the dark as possible. What an *honest* chairman of a meeting of a *christian* congregation!!!

FIFTHLY.—Hopkins most infamous doctrine.

Let us read it carefully. "*We as a congregation have nothing to do with our Minister, whether he preaches heresy or not, he is responsible to another Body, and to his God; we I say have nothing to do with it.*"

Can any doctrine—except a denial of God or gross blasphemy, be viler? We are to sit quietly and bear all manner of abominations preached, and find no fault. That is Hopkins doctrine; and that system sent the church of Rome finally to her great head—the Devil. Are you prepared to sustain him therein? the day is not far distant, when you will be called upon to say yea, or nay.

SIXTHLY.—Hopkins' abominable impudence and his thorough contempt of you.

"We have just called you together to sustain the Trustees in defending the action." "We have nothing more for you to do."

Enough of this base creature.

Let us next look at—

DONALD M'LELLAN.

His "unabated confidence in our esteemed pastor."

He—McLellan—has repeatedly declared his thorough condemna-

tion of David Inglis' Millenarian heresy; also his condemnation of the standing and singing the last psalm of the forenoon diet of worship, and the last psalm of the evening diet of worship. Even as lately as in my office on the Friday next preceding the said congregational meeting, when I asked him in presence of my brother, if he had spoken of me in disrespectful terms at any meeting of the Session, as I was told that he had, he positively denied it, and appealed to me, that I knew, that he was opposed to Mr. Inglis' Millenarian views; and that had he and Adam Cook been here when the change in the singing was made, they would have opposed it, as he thought David Inglis was wrong in both: and closed with the remark, "I know we are in a box, and the dear knows how we are to get out of it." So that McLellan's unabated confidence must have been—not in David's honesty in adhering to the standards of his Church, and his oath,—but in David's determination to hold the Millenarian heresy, in direct violation of said standards, as he McLellan knew that David held it, before his call here. But upon what his *esteem* of David could be founded, Donald must say, I cannot.

Next comes—

DOCTOR MACDONALD.

The Doctor's "unabated confidence." Shortly after I stopped David Inglis preaching so broadly as hetheretofore did his Millenarian heresy, some boasting by others was heard; amongst these, was the worthy Doctor above named, who asserted in speaking thereof, "we have stopped him." Upon what grounds therefore has Doctor Macdonald "unabated confidence in our esteemed pastor?" certainly and assuredly not—that David Inglis was "maintaining to the utmost of his power," the standards of our Church, which he had sworn to be "the truths of God:" for if so, why stop him? it was assuredly as wrong—grievously wrong in the Doctor to stop David preaching "the truths of God," as for David to submit to be stopped; pray then, what is the "unabated confidence?" and upon what does the "esteem" rest? If Hopkins' "unabated confidence" lay in his belief of David's capacious maw for money, as justly it might, pray Doctor, what did your's consist in? I have no doubt the congregation would like to know.

And, finally, for the present—

ADAM COOK.

Adam's "unabated confidence." At the congregational meeting to moderate in a call for a minister, when David Inglis was proposed, he—Adam Cook, rose and opposed him upon the ground that Mr. Inglis "preached strange doctrines." David's friends at once insisted upon an explanation of the "strange doctrines," pretending ignorance of same; but Adam being, as they well knew, one of that class of beings, whom ministers are fond, and whom the Rev. George

X of

P. Young very frequently in his sermons delighted to illustrate, by the following quotation from his favorite author—Cowper.

"Yon cottager who weaves at her own door,
Pillow and bobbins all her little store;
She for her humble sphere by nature fit,
Has little understanding and no wit.

could not explain further than that the same had something to do with the Millenarian heresy; whereupon as they have since boastingly said, they "bamboozled the body," and carried the nomination of David. But as Adam, since David's ministry here, has had clear and abundant demonstration by David's sermons, of the "strange doctrines," and being also well described by the following line from same poem,

"Just knows, and knows no more, his Bible true."

and in his native simplicity, not being able satisfactorily to judge for himself; and no doubt believing from the conduct of ministers in Church courts, that the following line from said poem, (which follows the last quoted line,)

"A truth the brilliant Frenchman never knew,"

(the Frenchman being Voltaire) might with justice be applied to them; and therefore, not having any confidence in *Church courts*, with all honesty and perfect sincerity of heart, voted for the resolution, firstly, as having found David holding the "strange doctrines," he had "unabated confidence in him, that he David held these doctrines, and that he—Adam—was right in his said former opposition; and, secondly, being desirous of having the action of ejection tried, and the question of David's heresy determined by a court of civil Law, in whose judgment he—Adam—could rest with confidence. Verily, here is an honest man.

Now for a few reflections. And first, as to the many falsehoods told about the matters in question, by some of you, who are members in full communion, and who regularly sit at the communion table. I will only cite one falsehood, which may be rightly called in the language of the Apostle, "Devlish," here it is. Mr. Walter Macdonald aforesaid was instructed by some of the Trustees of the Church, as part of his defence to the said action, that William P. MacLaren and the other persons who held the lots upon which your church is built, until that the congregation would in accordance with the statute in that behalf, declare the trusts upon which the lands should be held, conveyed these lots to the present Trustees, *contrary to the trusts in the deed to them of these lots, and without the knowledge of the Congregation*, (verily a fine position in which to place MacLaren and these others, charging them with a misdemeanor, punishable with imprisonment in the Penitentiary) and that therefore the present deed is void from the aforesaid gross fraud. This undoubtedly they considered a grand device by which they would avoid the necessity of defending the suit upon its

real merits, namely, Inglis' heresy and the other grounds; and this speaks strongly their fear of an *honest* defence. Mr. MacDonald so declared to me, in Mr. Stuart's office, in presence of Mr. Craig, and would not believe me that the said statements so made to him were gross falsehoods, until that he went with me to my office,—which he did forthwith, and which was before the said Congregational meeting, and examined the deed to MacLaren and these others, and the Declaration of Trust, unanimously adopted at a very large meeting of the Congregation, signed by David Inglis as Chairman thereof, and Mr. Andrew F. Skinner as Secretary, and which astonished him much; but he again assured me of the truth of his statements, that is—that he spoke truly, but peremptorily refused to name the creatures who made these statements to him.

And Second.—As to the action of ejectment. The chief grounds upon which the said action is grounded, are as follows, namely, a direct breach of the standards named in the Trust deed—which are the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Shorter Catechism. The Larger Catechism, and the Presbyterian Form of Church Government—in respect of firstly, doctrine, namely, David Inglis' Mellenarian heresy: and secondly, breach of the government, in subverting the worship without the order of the Synod, (we are Presbyterians,—not Congregationalists, and even had we been Congregationalists, our consent was not asked, but the change was made with all the high-handedness of priestly intolerance,) and by the minister and session not bringing before you, the Overture on union between our Church and the United Presbyterian Church, in accordance with strict Presbyterian usage. Another instance of priestly intolerance. Only imagine an union formed between two Bodies or Churches, without their knowledge, by their ministers, who are simply their hired servants, and that is what David Inglis has attempted with you. The following is the declaration in the Trust deed, by which the said action will be settled.

"In trust for the sole use benefit and behoof of a congregation of Presbyterians, strictly adhering to and practically or in practice, holding and maintaining. The confession of faith agreed upon by the assembly of Divines at Westminster, with the assistance of Commissioners from the Church of Scotland; and approved of by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland A.D. 1647. Also the Larger Catechism, and the Shorter Catechism, agreed upon by said assembly of Divines, at Westminster; and approved of by the General Assembly of the said Church of Scotland, A. D. 1648, and also the form of Presbyterian Church Government, agreed upon by the said assembly of Divines at Westminster, and approved of by the General Assembly of said Church of Scotland, A.D. 1645, and who are at present in connection with the Presbyterian church of Canada."

You may rest assured that the action will be tried, and had a fit Judge taken our last Assizes, it would have been tried at the same; and you may also rest assured, that I will abide by the result of it

when disposed of, and will rigidly carry out the same. The Church must and will be purged. Her standards must be maintained.

And lastly. The melancholy—because irreverent and irreligious—results already visible by the change of the worship, in some members of the congregation sitting during prayer, yea, I have even noticed two or three persons sitting during part of the prayers, to be able to rise and stand during the singing of the Psalm. Would any of these persons dare presume to present a petition in such a posture, to their earthly Sovereign? I trow not; they would bend the knee in lowly adoration before her, and yet they will dare commit the grossly irreligious act of so presenting their petitions to Jehovah. Bodily debility, and it only, can excuse such conduct.

I regret the soiling of these pages with the name of William Davidson, but "necessity has no law."

Faithfully yours,

COLIN D. REID.

P. S.—As I know not all the congregation, any one can have a copy hereof, by calling at my office.